

By Rana Foroohar

Campus wars: Has liberalism gone too far?

It started as a “he said, she said” story. In 2012, a Columbia University sophomore named Emma Sulkowicz had sex with a student from her class, Paul Nungesser. She claimed it was rape. He said the sex had been consensual. Sulkowicz filed a complaint with the university, which found Nungesser not responsible. A year-and-a-half later, she filed a police report, but after a few months stopped talking to the authorities.

But the drama was only just beginning. Sulkowicz began carrying a 50-pound mattress around campus, a representation of her version of the experience, which she also turned into her senior arts thesis, a project entitled “Mattress Performance (Carry That Weight)”. Under the self-imposed rules of the project, she had to carry the mattress wherever she went on campus, until Nungesser was no longer there.

Columbia didn’t expel Nungesser, since its own investigation found that he had done nothing wrong. But it also didn’t stop him from being hounded and ostracised as he found himself the subject of rape protest rallies, warning leaflets, and campus taunts. A month before both students received their degrees in 2015, Nungesser sued Columbia for violating Title IX, a 1972 law that was set up to deal with gender discrimination in public education. His lawyer, Andrew T Miltenberg, claimed Columbia had enabled the accuser’s gender-based harassment. This summer, the university settled with Nungesser, and issued a statement admitting that it had been “very difficult” for him following the investigation.

The whole episode might have been marvelled at, and then forgotten, if it had been happening in isolation. But it wasn’t. Since Title IX was passed, it has been used to argue a broader and broader number of cases of sexual harassment and assault. A storyline that American campuses were havens for sexual predators began to take hold, fuelled by a much-publicised study claiming that one out of every five women on campus had been sexually assaulted. The study was criticised for all sorts of reasons, from its methodology to what actually counted as sexual assault (not just rape but unwanted kissing or groping, whether it happened on or off campus). It was also belied by federal crime statistics that show violent assault to be on the decline, as well as myriad other studies that found minuscule rates of reported sexual assault on campus.

Nevertheless, worries grew, and hit fever pitch in 2011, with the then President Obama’s Department of Education advising all colleges to “take immediate and effective steps to end sexual harassment and sexual violence”, or risk losing federal funding. The result has, of course, been a dramatic increase in investigations (more than 200 schools are being examined for Title IX violations), as well as the growth of a cottage industry of consultants and administrators whose job it is to police the growing campus cul-

AP PHOTO



ture wars.

Yet many schools were already losing funding - and not because of President Barack Obama’s mandate. Indeed, that’s how I became interested in the story of the campus culture wars to begin with. I’m a business and economics columnist; I rarely write about cultural issues or (thankfully) psycho-sexual dramas playing out on campuses. But in the course of researching the burgeoning student debt bubble in the US, I discovered that one of the key reasons for the run up in debt had been eroding support for student fees on the part of individual states. While federal support for higher education has remained relatively steady during the past few decades,

Protests over a ‘rape culture’ and widespread racism within US universities have taken on a fervour that seems oddly incongruous with statistics

state support has been falling in large part because of the tax revolt waged by Grover Norquist and backed by the Koch brothers and other rich conservative donors. Such conservatives have been able to sell moderate Republicans on tax cuts that will defund the very state universities where many of their children go, in large part by portraying these places as havens of liberal excess and the sort of extreme identity politics that are anathema to conservatives and to an increasing number of Democrats.

They have a point. As sexual paranoia on campus has grown, so have accusations of racism, ageism and every other kind of bias on campus. Certainly, both racism and sexism exist on campus. There have been numerous scandals in recent years at schools such as Baylor, Stanford, and Florida State. A campus culture of excess drinking, often encouraged by the fraternity and sorority systems, doesn’t help matters. But the protests over a “rape culture” and widespread racism within US universities have taken on a fervour that seems oddly incongruous with statistics. Campuses are more diverse than they’ve ever been, and there are now more women than men in US higher education.

Meanwhile, the protests themselves have an anti-intellectual tenor that has begun to worry many observers. During the past few years, students and academics have demanded conservative speakers and even liberals who don’t spout the party line not be

allowed to lecture on campus, in some cases citing psychological research to argue that their words could induce psychological stress that was tantamount to physical violence. Books and lectures that might offend various sensibilities now come with “trigger” warnings. Professors are being directed to ask students in the beginning of each new class which pronoun they prefer to be addressed by. In the summer of 2015, a wave of campus protests broke out at dozens of schools from the University of Missouri to Yale, with students pushing universities to implement even broader policies designed to keep them “safer” from offence (eg micro-aggression

There has been a backlash against individual professors that seems only a step or two away from a Cultural Revolution-style shame circle

training seminars that teach how to discuss race and gender “properly”; additional college-funded research centres focused on issues of identity).

Since then, there has been a backlash against individual professors that seems only a step or two away from a Cultural Revolution-style shame circle. A professor at Yale whose wife had suggested that the school should lighten up on its policy of official caution against Halloween costumes that involve “cultural appropriation” or potentially hurtful stereotypes (Cowboys and Indians? Princess Jasmine? It’s hard to know what might run afoul of the rules) was encircled by dozens of students screaming that he was “disgusting” and “shouldn’t sleep at night”. A lecturer at Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington had to be escorted off campus by police after an angry mob of students interrupted his class. His crime? He had questioned the idea that the school should put in place “equity justification and explanations” for all new hires (he worried race and gender would take precedence over other criteria). When the college’s president met students to discuss the issue, he was shouted down by profanity and told to “shut up”.

“It’s the meltdown of a major American institution,” says NYU sociology professor Jonathan Haidt, who has co-founded a non-profit group, Heterodox Academy, to advocate for viewpoint diversity and free inquiry on US campuses. While Haidt is a



Campus wars: Has liberalism gone too far? (continued)

centrist who has never voted for a Republican, he is disturbed by the culling of conservative voices on campuses. As his website notes, the number of Republican academics has been falling since the mid-1990s; the 14 percent that still exist work mainly in engineering and professional schools (the same trend can be observed in higher education in the UK). "There's an almost religious quality to many of the protests," he notes, with chanting, ritual incantations, and an utter lack of space for dissent. The bottom line seems to be that the Enlightenment ideals of debate, discussion, and argument based on evidence and persuasion are under pressure in American universities.

It's one thing to protest, of course, but it's quite another to call for a ban on speakers whose ideas one doesn't like, or to bully professors or students with opposing views. So why are universities, which are probably the most liberal institutions in America, allowing such illiberal behaviour? The answer seems to lie in a murky mix of New Left identity politics, the ascent of a generation of students raised in a culture of intense individualism, and the rise of social media as an amplifier to it all. New research by social psychologist Jean Twenge shows that "iGen", the generation that came of age with the internet and began entering college a few years ago, has higher levels of anxiety and depression than previous generations, and seems less able to cope with the challenges of life.

The reasons for that may include everything from helicopter parenting to the narcissistic pressures of social media. But the upshot is that protec-

tion, rather than freedom, seems to be the new goal for students, which is a startling contrast with previous generations, for whom college was a place to push boundaries and even to engage in somewhat transgressive behaviour. Students these days aren't fighting for fewer intrusions on their lives by institutions, but rather demanding that institutions keep them "safe" by crafting ever more black-and-white rules to help them navigate the grey in what they perceive to be a dangerous world.

The result of it all is the narrowing of the scope for the kind of robust intellectual debate that people go to college for. "The anti-intellectualism of all this is really disturbing," says Laura Kipnis, a media studies professor at Northwestern who lit a powder keg under the debate last year with her book, *Unwanted Advances: Sexual Paranoia Comes to Campus*. This argues that not only has the definition of what constitutes sexual harassment been dramatically expanded, but that the campus women's movement has been hijacked by a kind of feminist paternalism that is taking women back to the 19th century, by putting them on a pedestal and fretting over their ability to consent to sexual activity and, if so, how. (On that note, it's hard to think of anything less sexy or more infantilising than, say, Oberlin College's red light/green light code that requires students to ask permission each time they want to kiss or touch their partner's body.)

Often times, Kipnis notes, the students that go in for this black-and-white, institutionally run system, "seem to come in with no sense of history, no sense of the struggles of the past, from

the Berkeley Free Speech movement to the feminist fight to achieve sexual freedom and autonomy".

Kipnis and many other academics blame administrators for helping to foster the culture wars, in part to justify their own jobs, which have proliferated in recent years, as fully tenured professorships and educational resources in general have fallen. It's the new job description of the college bureaucracy, after all, to keep students "safe".

It's the new job description of the college bureaucracy, after all, to keep students 'safe'

In one of the most heated current culture battles, at Harvard College, top administrators rather than students have led a campaign to outlaw exclusive single-gender organisations, including a number of old-line men's social clubs. First, they tried to ban the clubs on the grounds that they were bastions of sexual malfeasance (unsuccessfully - there's no evidence to prove that assault is any more common in single-sex men's clubs than in co-ed dorms). Now, the school is requiring every incoming Harvard freshman to sign an oath promising never to join one of these social clubs, and if they lapse, they'll be forbidden

from representing Harvard as a captain of a sports team, an elected leader of their class, or recipient of Harvard's backing for a Rhodes Scholarship and other graduate honours.

A number of the clubs have launched legal counter-attacks and, ironically, one (the old-line Fly Club) is being represented by a lawyer from the American Civil Liberties Union, Harvey Silverglate. "Harvard's idea of diversity," he says dismissively, "is for everyone to look different and think alike."

The recent protests in Charlottesville, Virginia, which turned violent, costing one young woman her life, are only the latest and most tragic example of how high the stakes have become in the culture wars. What's happening on campuses is just a leading indicator for the country at large, which seems all but literally at war with itself. The state of California, recently instituted a ban on taxpayer-funded travel to Texas; left-leaning state legislators didn't want to support any interaction with a state that questions gay marriage or transgender rights. On the flip side, Candice Jackson, the head of President Trump's Office for Civil Rights, recently enraged liberals by saying that "90 percent" of campus sexual assault accusations "fall into the category of 'we were both drunk'".

Yet even as the culture wars rage on, there are a few wise voices on the left that have begun to call for a sensible middle ground. Van Jones, the Democratic commentator and a former adviser to President Obama, has been speaking on college campuses about the importance of free speech, and the need for students to embrace all forms

of diversity - including cognitive diversity. When asked how students should react to speakers that they find ideologically offensive, he said, "I don't want you to be safe, ideologically. I don't want you to be safe emotionally. I want you to be strong. That's different. I'm not going to take all the weights out of the gym; that's the whole point of the gym."

Ironically, Betsy DeVos, President Trump's controversial education secretary (a woman who has taken flak for her support of gun rights and charter schools) may have struck something of a middle ground. She has called for the public to weigh in about the issue of Title IX and the potential problems with due process, to the Education Department. The outcome may be a revisiting of the Obama-era process around college assault or discrimination, with rules that could require more transparency on the part of schools regarding investigation, and/or more proof of guilt before the accused can be expelled.

"Any school that refuses to take seriously a student who reports sexual misconduct is one that discriminates," she said recently. "And any school that uses a system biased towards finding a student responsible for sexual misconduct also commits discrimination."

She added: "A system without due process ultimately serves no one."

It's something that all Americans would do well to remember.

Rana Foroohar is the FT's global business columnist.

Copyright The Financial Times Limited 2017

GAMING

Risks for casinos in Japan are bigger than they might imagine

By Leo Lewis

A night out in Japan may swirl alluringly from karaoke bar to Michelin-starred restaurant and back to an onsen hot spring, but from a stock investor's point of view, there is nothing remotely tuneful, delicious or relaxing about the Japanese leisure industry. The world's biggest casino operators are about to discover that frustration.

In theory, Japanese leisure should offer investors good hunting: for most forms of entertainment there is a listed local company available to play hunches and even pair trades. It is quite possible, as one Tokyo-based broker recommended after noting his own family's spending habits, to go "long badminton, short bowling" - a logical, but terrible, piece of advice.

Added to the superficial appeal of the leisure sector is the unexpected robustness of spending despite the demographic headwinds that otherwise blunt enthusiasm for

domestic Japanese growth. That narrative was put into hard numbers last month in the Japan Productivity Council's Leisure white paper, which showed the Japanese leisure market has steadily expanded since Prime Minister Shinzo Abe came to power in 2012, and last year stood at USD636 billion.

The agony, though, is that listed company profits and share prices do not behave as they should based on the trends the white paper describes. Management choices matter far more than the prevailing winds in each segment, especially when the entire market is ageing. Take bowling as an example. The white paper shows an industry whose national revenues have halved since the turn of the millennium; yet the shares of Round One, which runs a national chain of bowling alleys, are up 60 percent year to date.

Grabber games, when loaded with cartoon-themed cuddly toys, have driven a startling revival in Japanese games ar-

cade. But operating profits for Adores, one of the largest arcade operators, plummeted 86 percent year on year in the first quarter of the current financial year. Cycling and camping, the report suggests, dominate Japanese weekends; shares in Shimano and Snow Peak are down 19 and 9 percent respectively since the start of the year.

Baseball game attendance has risen every year since 2013; shares in Tokyo Dome have shed a third of their value since then. This is all set against a market where the benchmark Topix index has risen almost 10 percent to close yesterday at a 25-month high.

In the past, these paradoxes might have stayed the niche concern of Japan-focused fund managers. In 2017, they are of critical concern to Las Vegas casino giants, international hotel operators, global event management companies and a growing parade of businesses preparing to invest multiple billions of dollars in Japan's first integrated resorts when they are given the legal green light. They must,

unfortunately for their own investors, become unparalleled experts in a Japanese leisure market notorious for defying investment expertise.

The urgency makes it worse. The conditions under which casinos can operate have yet to be decided by Japan's parliament. There are other hurdles still to jump, and only one city - Osaka - has clearly said it will welcome the business. But the potential rewards are high. Projections of what Japan would look like with casinos have convinced the operators that it would become the world's second-biggest gaming market after Macau - a feat that could be achieved if only a small fraction of that \$636 billion leisure pot is diverted to the tables and slots.

Investors are focusing on how an ageing Japan currently gambles and what this might mean for the prospects of casinos. Lottery ticket sales are at their lowest in a decade. But just as Mr Abe came to power, an intriguing inflection point occurred. Revenues from



Pachinko players in an arcade in Japan

pachinko - the vertical pinball game whose annual revenues of \$200 billion are down 40 percent since 2005 - were falling but horseracing revenues, now \$30 billion annually, were beginning a four-year, 20 percent surge.

The former strongly suggests that Japan is rapidly losing its desire to sit in front of bright machines and wager money. But the latter - partly driven

by an app that allows people to watch and bet on horse races via their phones throughout the day - suggests that simple technological improvements could inspire widespread Japanese gambling fever. The casinos are desperate to enter this market, but the risks may be bigger than they imagine.

Copyright The Financial Times Limited 2017



A group of American tourists listen to their tour guide next to the wall of the Old City of Jerusalem

Zionist evangelicals trail Trump to Holy Land with cash in hand

By Jonathan Ferziger

AS the Jewish High Holiday season moves in, Israel is getting set to welcome a throng of religious visitors - evangelical Christians.

Thousands will pour in from more than 80 countries to the streets of Jerusalem in early October for an annual march celebrating the Feast of Tabernacles, or the Jewish festival of Sukkot. As they follow in the footsteps of Jesus, whose holiday visit to the city is described in the Book of John, they'll also be rallying behind the modern state of Israel.

Evangelicals from the U.S. alone pump more than half a billion dollars a year into Israeli tourism and charity, while endorsing the country's conservative politics in a controversial alliance. Donald Trump's recent visit to the Jewish state has energized fundraising efforts as evangelicals try to ramp up support for a land many see as God-given.

"After the elections, being pro-Israel became a part of the

establishment, rather than part of the opposition," said Rabbi Tuly Weisz, who raises money for charities from evangelicals through his israel365.com website. "I do believe that this year's increase in tourism and overall growth in charitable giving can be partially attributed to the fact that the Trump administration is seen to be extremely pro-Israel."

Although some fundraisers haven't seen a Trump-related uptick in donations, Mike Evans, founder of the Friends of Zion Museum in Jerusalem, saw the U.S. president's May visit as a peerless opportunity to recruit Christian support. He hailed Trump as the Jewish state's best friend in a post to his 28 million Facebook followers, and draped buildings with three-story banners urging the U.S. president to "Make Israel Great."

"I want to do whatever I can to influence him to care about the Jewish people," Evans said.

UNPARALLED SUPPORT

Polls show no other group in the U.S. supports the Jewish

state more than evangelicals - not even American Jews. Israel can count on their unstinting support in Washington, and Netanyahu recognizes the power of their backing as he faces multiple criminal investigations that could drive him from office.

"Millions and millions of Americans cheering him and

Millions and millions of Americans cheering him and donating money to Israel sends an image that is very powerful to the Israeli public.

JONATHAN RYNHOLD
BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY POLITICAL
SCIENTIST

donating money to Israel sends an image that is very powerful to the Israeli public," said Jonathan Rynhold, a Bar-Ilan University political scientist who has studied the evangelicals' relationship with Israel.

In the midst of an eastern European tour in July, the prime minister made sure to address the Washington conference organized by evangelical pastor John Hagee's Christians United for Israel, appearing on two massive screens by satellite from Budapest.

"We have no better friends than you," Netanyahu declared. "You are always there for us."

ALLIANCE QUESTIONED

Israel didn't always welcome evangelicals, who are the subject of an anti-missionary law. Many believe Jews must return to the biblical Land of Israel to facilitate a Second Coming of Christ. Some say masses of Jews will die in the final struggle between God and Satan if they don't accept Jesus Christ as their Lord.

Others see an unholy alliance. Deeply fervent Jews suspect all

evangelicals are missionaries, while secular liberals deplore their conservative politics and support for Israel's settlement of captured lands Palestinians claim for a state.

"We do not seek their honey, and we do not seek their bee sting," said a West Bank rabbinical council's 2014 ruling, quoting a Talmudic adage.

NEW ALLIES

Still, for official Israel, the outpouring of love is a boon as it seeks new allies in the face of growing antagonism in the U.S. and Western Europe toward its occupation of land Palestinians claim for a state. Evangelicals see things differently, and according to the Israeli Tourism Ministry are flying in in even greater numbers this year to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the 1967 Middle East war, when Israel captured Jerusalem's Old City and West Bank biblical sites.

In a 2014 Pew Research Center poll, 82 percent of white evangelicals in the U.S. said they believe Israel was given by God to the Jewish people, versus 40 percent of Jews. Almost 60 percent of evangelicals, according to a 2015 Bloomberg poll, said they would back Israel regardless of U.S. interests.

ECONOMIC BOON

Rabbi Yechiel Eckstein is the heavyweight champ in raising money from evangelicals. His International Fellowship of Christians and Jews collected \$132 million in 2015 - the last year for which records were publicly available - much of it going to the poor in Israel and other Jewish communities, according to Internal Revenue Service records.

"I demonstrated that there was this group out there that is growing in numbers and influence and that it's important for the Jewish community to reach out to them, and that it could be done with integrity by a Jewish rabbi," Eckstein said.

Organizations such as Hagee's CUFI have modeled their approach on Aipac, the pro-Israel lobby known for its mastery of Washington politics, according to David Brog, a former CUFI chief executive now leading billionaire Sheldon Adelson's campaign against Israel boycott efforts on college campuses.

"Almost every politician in America gets that if you want to appeal to evangelical Christians, you talk about traditional values, about being 'pro-life' and also about your support for Israel," said Brog, a cousin of former Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak. "Even a guy like Donald Trump who didn't share the values of the religious Christian community was able to talk about Israel in a way that really galvanized people." **Bloomberg**

Shark fin bans might not help sharks, scientists say

By Patrick Whittle, Portland

As lawmakers propose banning the sale of shark fins in the U.S., a pair of scientists is pushing back, saying the effort might actually harm attempts to conserve the marine predators.

Democratic Sen. Cory Booker of New Jersey introduced a bill this year designed to prevent people from possessing or selling shark fins in America, much to the delight of conservation groups such as Oceana. But marine scientists David Shiffman and Robert Hueter said this approach could be wrongheaded.

Shiffman and Hueter authored a study that appears in the November issue of the journal *Marine Policy*, saying that the U.S. has long been a leader in shark fisheries management and that shutting down the U.S. fin trade entirely would remove a model for sustainability for the rest of the world.

The U.S. also is a minor contributor to the worldwide shark fin trade, and countries with less regulated fisheries would likely step in to fill the void if America left the business altogether, Shiffman said.

"Removing that from the marketplace removes a template of a well-managed fishery," said Shiffman, a shark researcher with Simon Fraser University in British Columbia. "It's much easier for us to say, here's a way you



can do this."

Shark fins are most often used in a soup considered a delicacy in Asia. Shark fins that American fishermen harvest are often shipped to Asia for processing.

Environmentalists and animal advocates have long blamed shark fin soup for the decline of certain shark species. Their criticism of shark fin soup often includes arguments against "finning," which is a practice that's illegal in the United States and involves

removing the fins from recently caught, often live sharks and discarding the animals.

Nearly a quarter of U.S. states have bans in place on the sale of fins, and sharks were afforded new protections with the Shark Conservation Act of 2010. But the country still has hundreds of shark fishermen, and they are allowed to have the shark's fins removed for sale during processing on land.

Booker's proposal would chan-

ge that, making it illegal for any person to "possess, transport, offer for sale, sell, or purchase shark fins or products containing shark fins." The bill was approved by a commerce and science committee in May, and a similar bill has been proposed in the House of Representatives.

More than 100 scientists have endorsed the bill, said Kristin Lynch, a spokeswoman for Booker.

"Unfortunately, current laws

have proven inadequate at stopping the trade of fins from threatened and endangered sharks," she said.

Marine conservation group Oceana is standing by Booker's proposal, said Lora Snyder, a campaign director for the group. Shutting down the fin trade is akin to getting the U.S. out of the ivory business, she said.

A "near total" ban on commercial elephant ivory took hold in the U.S. last year, according to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

The U.S. fin trade needs to be shut down in part because violations of the "finning" ban have continued to take place, Snyder said. An investigation by Booker's office earlier this year showed that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has investigated more than 500 incidents of alleged shark finning since 2010.

"Yes, we are better, but just because we are better doesn't mean we are good," Snyder said. "There are other threats facing sharks, but this is a very important step in the right direction."

Some commercial fishing groups have vowed to fight efforts to shut down the fin trade. About a quarter of the value of a shark is in its fins, and the rest is in its meat, Shiffman and Hueter's study said.

That means the fin ban is essentially an effort to shut down shark fishing altogether, said Jeff Oden, a Hatteras, North Carolina, fisherman who started fishing for sharks about 30 years ago.

"They want to stop it, just period," he said. "Forget the fact that we fish sustainably in this country." AP

ASK THE VET

by Dr Ruan Du Toit Bester



ACRAL LICK GRANULOMA TREATMENT WITH VETERINARY LASER SURGERY

ACRAL lick granuloma is a frustrating skin disorder which vets are often forced to treat on a trial and error basis, because no single treatment method has proven consistently effective. Veterinary laser surgery is a new treatment option that we use for lick granulomas which is gaining widespread praise for successful outcomes. Here's some information about the illness and this popular procedure.

Canine Lick Granuloma

The condition is a dermatitis affecting dogs. It is caused by a dog's constant, compulsive licking of an area - usually on the lower front legs or carpal region, just above the paws. The tissue in this area is inflamed by the licking. Hair falls off, skin thickens and becomes red and ulcerated. The skin starts to itch and that makes the dog lick more until the inflamed area cannot heal. This makes the dog lick even more.

The vicious cycle continues and creates aggravating conditions such as secondary infection. If you see your dog licking its front paws more than usual, check for raised,

hairless, red patches of thickened skin in the area and see your vet if you find them.

Diagnosis

No single lick granuloma treatment method can be selected until a vet determines what actually started the dog's behavior. It could have a psychological origin like stress or anxiety. Some dogs lick because it imparts a feeling of comfort or well-being. This has been attributed to the release of chemicals in the dog's brain called endorphins. In other words, licking releases brain chemicals that make some dogs feel so good that they can't stop licking. There may be some underlying medical problem such as a tumor, trauma or parasites. Any of these and other things can start the cycle, and each possible root cause requires a different treatment modality.

Be patient and remember that the process of finding an origin for the disorder in any individual case can be long and challenging. A number of skin tests and other diagnostic procedures may be necessary and your vet may interview you extensively about when the licking started and when it seems at its worst.



Laser Surgery

Whatever the cause of the lick granuloma, any treatment must repair the inflamed tissue if the licking is to stop. This is where laser surgery has been beneficial in many cases. When a veterinary surgeon uses a laser light on the inflamed tissue, the thickened, diseased layers of skin are burned away. Nerve tissue in that area is sealed at the same time, so the dog experiences almost no pain and there is very little bleeding associated with the treatment.

The final stage of treatment will focus on reducing or eliminating the compulsive licking. This could involve anything from covering the affected area with a protective shield, up to and including prescribing an-

ti-depressants or tranquilizers, or coating the repaired tissue area with something that tastes bad to discourage more licking.

If your vet does not offer laser treatments, he or she can refer you to a vet who does.

Hope this info helps
Till next week
Dr Ruan

Ask the Vet:

Royal Veterinary Centre

Tel: +853 28501099, +853 28523678

Emergency: +853 62662268

Email: royalveterinary@gmail.com